

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116
Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2100
Application No. 09/869,513
Paper Dated: November 29, 2005
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005
Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

REMARKS

The Office Action, dated September 22, 2005, has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. The present Amendment amends claims 1, 39 and 40, all in accordance with the originally-filed specification. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-42 remain in this application, and claims 1, 39 and 40 are in independent form.

Initially, the Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-42 under the judicially created doctrine of double patent in view of claims 1-158 of co-pending Application Serial No. 09/809,595 to Applicant. Applicant notes that this rejection is provisional. As such, this rejection will be appropriately addressed when the conflicting claims in the co-pending application have been patented.

Claims 1-42 stand rejected. In particular, claims 1-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,343,313 to Salesky et al. (hereinafter "the Salesky patent"). In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections in light of amendments to all independent claims 1, 39 and 40 as discussed below.

Summary of the Invention

Independent claims 1, 39 and 40 of the present application have been amended to more clearly demonstrate the novel and non-obvious differences between the present invention and the cited prior art. In summary, and as discussed in the previously-filed Response, Applicant's system is an *application service provider or ASP model* for conducting the convention on a central website with website program instructions. Alternatively, the system of the Salesky patent is a shared-display communications webcast system with conferencing software loaded on the presenter client computer and the attendee

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116

Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2100

Application No. 09/869,513

Paper Dated: November 29, 2005

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

client computer. It is submitted that amended claims 1, 39 and 40 better clarify this unique difference.

In particular, and as set forth in independent claim 1 of the present application, as amended, the present invention is directed to a method for conducting at least one convention, by website program instructions on a central website facilitating the exchange between at least one meeting planner client and at least one attendee client. This method includes the steps of: receiving, from the at least one meeting planner client, and electronically storing at a central website, convention content information for a plurality of conventions; receiving at the central website from the at least one attendee client a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions; and releasing from the central website to the at least one attendee client the selected convention content information.

Further, as set forth in independent claim 39 of the present application, as amended, the present invention is directed to a method for conducting at least one convention, by website program instructions on a central website facilitating the exchange between at least one meeting planner client and at least one attendee client. The method includes the steps of: receiving, from the at least one meeting planner client, and electronically storing at a central website, convention content information for a plurality of conventions; receiving at the central website from the at least one attendee client a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions; receiving at the central website from the attendee client information necessary to register for the convention; and releasing from the central website to the at least one attendee client the selected convention content information.

Still further, as set forth in independent claim 40 of the present application, as amended, the present invention is directed to a system for conducting at least one convention,

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116

Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2100

Application No. 09/869,513

Paper Dated: November 29, 2005

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

by website program instructions on a central website facilitating the exchange between at least one meeting planner client and at least one attendee client. This system includes: means for receiving, from the at least one meeting planner client, and means for electronically storing at a central website, convention content information for a plurality of conventions; means for receiving at the central website from the at least one attendee client a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions; and means for releasing from the central website to the at least one attendee client the selected convention content information.

Summary of the Salesky Patent and System Topology

In general, the Salesky patent is directed to a computer conferencing system having real-time, multipoint, multi-speed and multi-stream scalability. In today's Internet language, the Salesky patent is referred to as describing a real-time webcast session or system. The underlying equipment-network-software topology of the Salesky patent is found at column 3, lines 56-58 which states: "the 'communications server' connecting the 'source' and 'sink' client machines of the 'communicants' during a communication session". Throughout the Salesky patent, the design requisite and specific "conferencing software", first found at column 2, lines 2-3, purposely occupies either or both the "source" and "sink" client machines and is a design constant when linked with the "communications server".

The webcast operation with the specific and client-based "conferencing software" for the presenter client is found at column 2, lines 30-43 of the Salesky patent:

Conferencing software on the presenter client computer captures a portion of the screen display of the presenter client and sends the captured region (after possibly compressing it or applying other transformations) to the conference server. The captured region can be anything the presenter client can have displayed on its screen or a portion thereof, whether or not the hardware or other software producing or managing any part of the display is aware of the conferencing system. When the attendee selects a link from the Web page to

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116

Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2100

Application No. 09/869,513

Paper Dated: November 29, 2005

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

begin the conferencing session for that attendee, this action initiates the attendee client conferencing software. The attendee client then obtains a current view of the captured region from the conference server.

The attendee client software is also specific and client-based, and corresponds “tightly bound” (col. 7, line 22 of the Salesky patent) to the presenter client conferencing software. “The presenter client conferencing software, which is usually distributed tightly bound with the attendee client software to facilitate presenter hand-offs from conferee to conferee, captures information (such as image, sound, or other output information) from a program or programs running on the presenter's machine and relays it to the server”. Col. 7, lines 21-27 of the Salesky patent.

The role of the “conference server” in the Salesky patent is one of communications-related data transmitting stream controls in terms of the underlying equipment-network-software topology. This detailed and specific role is set forth in claim 1 of the Salesky patent, which reads:

1. A conferencing system comprising:

at least one client;

a conference server;

network connections between the conference server and the at least one client, wherein the at least one client maintains a version of a shared portion of a display, wherein the conference server updates said version of said shared portion of said display with data updates, after taking into consideration the network connections speeds and loads and client computing speeds and loads, wherein the conference server is capable of delivering the data updates in an output data type selected from base uncompressed data, base compressed data, differenced uncompressed data and differenced compressed data, and wherein the output data type is selected based on the network connections speeds and loads, conference server computing speeds and loads, and client computing speeds and loads, and wherein the conference server is capable of transmitting said shared portion of said display to two or more clients in parallel.

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116

Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2100

Application No. 09/869,513

Paper Dated: November 29, 2005

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

Summary of the Present Invention and System Topology

As a general background to the claimed method and system, and as discussed in the previously-filed Response to the previous Office Action, it is submitted that the present invention is directed to the technology behind how the meeting planner client (or administrator) and the exhibitor client can themselves, separately and interactively, encode a relational database with functional descriptive material and operate their distinct aspects of a virtual convention website. In terms of the underlying equipment-network-software topology, the meeting planner client (or administrator) 102, the exhibitor client 103, and the attendee client 101 conduct the convention by website program instructions 400 on a central website 200. This process is accomplished wholly with web browser software at each client end, *with the website program instructions on a central website*. The convention is conducted without any specific and client-based conferencing software, such as is required by the system of the Salesky patent.

The meeting planner client (or administrator) can also set convention operational control parameter rules to customize the operation or processing flow of the virtual navigational experience of the exhibitor clients or attendee clients. The present invention provides a precise technology, where the meeting planner client (or administrator) and the exhibitor client can *themselves* separately self-develop, encode and fully maintain, through central website database-server program instruction control, single or multiple-show or virtual convention website processes. The present invention further defines the technology behind how the end user clients of the convention or show process can interactively create and operate such websites.

It is further submitted that the present invention addresses the underlying technology for supporting the arrangement of integrated and centralized convention relationships or channels of multiple conventions (i.e., one-to-many and many-to-many)

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116

Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2100

Application No. 09/869,513

Paper Dated: November 29, 2005

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

without the use of webmaster programmers or website development firms. These channels can be used for multiple shows or conventions for an individual show operator or a solitary non-profit association, or larger, a comprehensive-industry-wide website service, where all industry-wide shows and conventions (made up of single shows or conventions) are contained at a central website service site with relational database capabilities.

Prior to the Applicant's invention, no Internet-based application service provider ("ASP") or hosted systems existed that would permit meeting planners (or administrator) or tradeshow organizers within the meetings, convention and trade show industry, including exhibitors and attendees to:

- (i) interactively conduct purely 100% cyber-based conventions;
- (ii) augment venue-based conventions with an Internet-based experience; or
- (iii) host "combined" cyber- and venue-based conventions.

In addition, prior to the present invention, tradeshow websites were custom built by webmaster programmers for single-specific conventions. Meeting planners or tradeshow organizers within the meetings, convention and tradeshow industries could not, themselves, interactively encode a relational database with functional descriptive material and operate single convention websites with solely web browser skills. Likewise, exhibitors within the meetings, convention and tradeshow industries could not, themselves, interactively encode a relational database with functional descriptive material and add virtual booths at a single convention website with solely web browser skills. Meeting planners, administrators or tradeshow organizers could not, themselves, interactively create multiple or unlimited conventions at a website using relational database cross-referencing fields, thereby minimizing data entry tasks while maximizing attendee browsing functions based upon a wide array of functional descriptive material. Fundamentally, the meeting planners,

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116

Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2100

Application No. 09/869,513

Paper Dated: November 29, 2005

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

administrators or tradeshow organizers could not interactively create, themselves, integrated centralized conventions switches or channels in an end-user controlled framework. Exhibitors could not, themselves, interactively create and add virtual booths across multiple conventions within integrated centralized convention channels, thereby providing master purchasing agreement capabilities with the meeting planners, administrators or tradeshow organizers.

A significant technical problem associated with the prior art is loading and operating conventions, which has been solved by the present invention. In particular, the present invention implements numerous inventive steps, for example facilitating how a meeting planner client (or administrator) interactively loads convention content information for a single convention, and for a plurality of conventions. There are significant and inventive steps not only in receiving and storing convention content information, but the control parameter rules of how a specific convention will operate. There are even more inventive steps directed to how a plurality of conventions are interactively loaded and provided in terms of the virtual convention experience for the attendee client.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing inherent or obvious about receiving from an attendee client a selection for convention content information from the plurality of conventions after such convention content information is loaded by a meeting planner client (or administrator). The database design and computer programming supporting the process of receiving such a selection and releasing appropriate content for such a selection is novel and requires non-obvious database fields and relationships, and processing steps, for example processing controlled by the parameter rules included in the functional descriptive material for the attendee client's navigational experience.

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116

Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2100

Application No. 09/869,513

Paper Dated: November 29, 2005

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

*The Prior Art of Record does not Teach or Suggest A Conference System
where Website Program Instructions on a Central Website Facilitate the Exchange*

In the presently-pending Office Action, the Examiner indicates that “Salesky discloses method for conducting at least one convention, by facilitating the exchange between at least one meeting planner client and at least one attendee client (convention means coming together, as a group of people meeting in one place, col 7, lines 1-4, fig 1, 18(a-c), 12, conference server, 14, is facilitating the exchange between, presenter or planner, 12 and attendee client).” The Examiner next observes “In response to applicant’s argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant’s invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the application service provider or ASP model) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.”

Independent claims 1, 39 and 40 of the present application have been amended to more clearly demonstrate Applicant’s application service provider or ASP model of conducting the convention on a central website with website program instructions from the Salesky patent’s shared-display communications webcast system with conferencing software loaded on the presenter client computer and the attendee client computer, as described above. Claims 1 and 39 now recite a method for conducting at least one convention, by website program instructions on a central website facilitating the exchange between at least one meeting planner client and at least one attendee client. Correspondingly, amended claim 40 is directed to a system for conducting at least one convention, by website program instructions on a central website facilitating the exchange between at least one meeting planner client and at least one attendee client”. It should be noted that the word or terms “website”, “website program”, “website program instructions”, or “central website” do not appear in the Salesky patent.

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116

Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2100

Application No. 09/869,513

Paper Dated: November 29, 2005

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

When the Applicant's amended claims are now interpreted in light of the considerable specification, the reader can clearly distinguish the claims from prior art. In terms of the underlying equipment-network-software topology, the meeting planner client (or administrator) 102, the exhibitor client 103, and the attendee client 101 conduct the convention by website program instructions 400 on a central website 200. Clearly, the present invention is directed to the technology behind how the meeting planner client and the exhibitor client can themselves, separately and interactively, encode a relational database with functional descriptive material and operate their distinct aspects of the central website 200 with database updating processing and dynamic page information display, without any web-page-publishing or website programming (e.g., via HTML or similar) skills, but rather solely web browser skills. The meeting planner client can also set convention operational control parameter rules to customize the operation or processing flow of the virtual navigational experience of the exhibitor clients or attendee clients. The present invention provides a precise technology, where the meeting planner client and the exhibitor client can themselves separately self-develop, encode and fully maintain, through website program instructions 400, single or multiple-show or virtual convention website processes.

Referring now to the lower half of page 13 - Paragraph 46 of the Examiner's detailed Responses to the Office Action of 9/22/2005, Applicant respectfully acknowledges the Examiner's response that the Salesky patent does not disclose receiving, from the at least one meeting planner client, and electronically storing at a central website, convention content information for a plurality of conventions.

Next, in Paragraph 46 (top of page 14), the Examiner responds "Salesky discloses receiving at the central website (conference server, 14, fig 2) from the at least one attendee client (a conferee client, 17, 14, fig 2, col 8, lines 34-41) a selection for convention

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116

Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2100

Application No. 09/869,513

Paper Dated: November 29, 2005

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions (conferee locates a conference listing, col 8, lines 34-45)” (emphasis added).

Significantly, and discussed at length below, Fig. 2 of the Salesky patent illustrates that there are no communications to the conference server 14 during the “locate” process, and the specification corroborates that the communications to the conference server 14 occurs only after the “locate” step. Hence, the Salesky patent does not disclose receiving at the central website (conference server, 14, fig 2) from the at least one attendee client (a conferee client, 17, 14, fig 2, col 8, lines 34-41) a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions (conferee locates a conference listing, col 8, lines 34-45) – because there is no communication with (conference server, 14, fig 2) at the “locate” step.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing inherent or obvious within the amended claim language – “by website program instructions on a central website facilitating the exchange” - about receiving from an attendee client a selection for convention content information from the plurality of conventions after such convention content information is loaded by a meeting planner client, by website program instructions on a central website facilitating the exchange. The relational database design and computer programming supporting the process of receiving such a selection and releasing appropriate convention content information for such a selection is novel and requires non-obvious database fields and relationships, and processing steps, as found in the substantial specifications website program instructions 400 on a central website 200.

With respect to Fig. 2 of the Salesky patent, and the Examiner’s specific reference of (conferee locates a conference listing, col 8, lines 34-45), opposite Applicant’s “a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions” (emphasis added to “locate” in this discussion). Fig. 2 is a drawing showing “a

flowchart illustrating the connection of a conferee client computer to a conference server” Col. 4, lines 53-54 of the Salesky patent. Inspection of Fig. 2 of the Salesky patent, the Examiner can observe from the START at Conferee client 17, that the scheme for (conferee locates a conference listing) is illustrated by the very first flowchart box – “Conferee locates WWW URL for a conference”. Notably, this flowchart method box is depicted wholly within the Conferee client 17 without any arrows showing communication to the Conference server 14. Fig. 2 shows the first connection arrow to Conference server 14 in the third box down in the Conferee client 17 process – “Conferee points browser to conference URL, provides keyword if needed” - well after the conference URL has already been located from outer-(conference server 14) sources, or simply “being told a URL” (col 8, line 36).

The findings from the Fig. 2 drawing of the Salesky patent, that there has been no communication with the (conference server, 14, fig 2) when the (conferee locates a conference listing), is also supported by the description of the preferred embodiment. The terms “locate” and “locator” are only found in the first two lines at column 8, lines 34-45 with:

First, the conferee locates a conference listing. This may be done by finding or being told a URL or using a locator service such as ULS™ or LDAP™. The conferee also specifies an icon to be used as a pointer label. Then the conferee points a WWW browser to the conference listing, where the server offering this listing or an associated server validates the conferee and provides information that allows the attendee client conferencing software to start and to connect to conference server 14 itself, possibly after further validation. (emphasis added)

Therefore, because the Fig. 2 drawing illustrates that there are no communications to the conference server 14 during the “locate” process, and the specification corroborates that the communication to the conference server 14 occurs only after the “locate” step or process, it can be respectfully concluded that Salesky does not disclose receiving at the central website (conference server, 14, fig 2) from the at least one attendee

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116

Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2100

Application No. 09/869,513

Paper Dated: November 29, 2005

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

client (a conferee client, 17, 14, fig 2, col 8, lines 34-41) a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions (conferee locates a conference listing, col 8, lines 34-45) – because there is no communication with (conference server, 14, fig 2) at the “locate” step.

Next, in Paragraph 46 (middle of page 14), the Examiner responds “Salesky discloses convention content (meeting content, col 24, lines 66-67)” (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing inherent or obvious within the amended claim language – “by website program instructions on a central website facilitating the exchange” - about receiving from the at least one meeting planner client, and electronically storing at a central website, convention content information for a plurality of conventions - or - receiving at the central website from the at least one attendee client a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions – or - releasing from the central website to the at least one attendee client the selected convention content information, after such convention content information is loaded by a meeting planner client, by website program instructions on a central website facilitating the exchange. The relational database design and computer programming supporting the process of receiving such convention content information and electronically storing at a central website is novel and requires non-obvious database fields and relationships, and processing steps, as found in the substantial specifications website program instructions 400 on a central website 200.

Applicant further submits that the Examiner may have misinterpreted Applicant’s use of the term “convention content information” in the present application, and incorrectly referenced the term “meeting content”, in singular form by misquoting “Salesky discloses convention content (meeting content, col 24, lines 66-67)”. Respectfully, the term “meeting contents” (col. 24, lines 66) (emphasis added to denote plural form only was used)

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116

Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2100

Application No. 09/869,513

Paper Dated: November 29, 2005

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

of the Salesky patent and the term “convention content information” in the present application are not comparable. In the Salesky patent at column 24, lines 66 the plural form “meeting contents” is used. In particular, the Examiner appears to have then possibly misinterpreted the precise or correct term “meeting contents” (col 24, lines 66), in singular form – deriving, in isolation, a separate term not consistent with the teachings of the Salesky patent. A closer inspection of this section of the Salesky patent further indicates a noun followed by an adjective: “...stored meeting contents” (col 24, line 66). Taken out of context in singular form, “convention content” (Examiner) renders a significantly different and far-wider meaning. Applicant respectfully submits that the meaning of the “meeting contents” (col 24, line 66), coupled with an adjective “stored” (col 24, line 66) of the Salesky patent is not comparable to and conflicts with Applicant’s term “convention content information”.

Specifically, the term “meeting contents” appears only twice in the Salesky patent, both times in the paragraph at column 24, line 66 through column 25, line 10, and appears as mere naming of subject matter – not at all descriptive of or comparable to “convention content information” of the present application. The first time the term “meeting contents” appears with the adjective “stored” (col. 24, line 66), therefore rendering “stored meeting contents”, and then the second time the term appears with the adjective “recorded” (col. 25, line 9), rendering “recorded meeting contents”. Hence, the Salesky patent was describing stored recordings of a conferencing or other communications session data streams at this reference.

Therefore, the use of the term “meeting contents” (col. 24, lines 66-67) in the Salesky patent is mere naming or description of the stored recordings of the communications session data streams, and is not an assertedly anticipating reference and does not provide an enabling disclosure of the applicant’s subject matter which is comprehensively supported by

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116

Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2100

Application No. 09/869,513

Paper Dated: November 29, 2005

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

functional descriptive material. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that “meeting contents” at column 24, lines 66-67 are not comparable to and conflicts with Applicant’s term “convention content information”. Accordingly, the Salesky patent does not define, disclose, teach or suggest “convention content information for a plurality of conventions” as specifically set forth in the amended independent claims of the present application.

Next, in Paragraph 46 of the 9/22/2005 Office Action (at bottom of page 14), the Examiner responds “Salesky discloses electronically storing (16, fig 1, col 30, lines 20-21, Meeting DB)” (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing inherent or obvious within the amended claim language – “by website program instructions on a central website facilitating the exchange” - about receiving from the at least one meeting planner client, and electronically storing at a central website, convention content information for a plurality of conventions, after such convention content information is loaded by a meeting planner client, by website program instructions on a central website facilitating the exchange. The relational database design and computer programming supporting the process of receiving such convention content information and electronically storing at a central website is novel and requires non-obvious database fields and relationships, and processing steps, as found in the substantial specifications website program instructions 400 on a central website 200.

Finally, in Paragraph 46 of the 9/22/2005 Office Action (at top of page 15), the Examiner responds “Salesky discloses releasing from the central website to the at least one attendee client the selected convention content information (17, 14, fig 2, col 8, lines 35-45, server provides information that allows attendee client conferencing software to start and connect to the conference).” Again, Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing inherent or obvious within the amended claim language – “by website program instructions

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116

Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2100

Application No. 09/869,513

Paper Dated: November 29, 2005

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

on a central website facilitating the exchange” – about releasing from the central website to the at least one attendee client the selected convention content information, after such convention content information is loaded by a meeting planner client, by website program instructions on a central website facilitating the exchange. The relational database design and computer programming supporting the process of receiving such convention content information and electronically storing at a central website is novel and requires non-obvious database fields and relationships, and processing steps, as found in the substantial specifications website program instructions 400 on a central website 200.

Summary

In summary, the present invention provides for the creation of a virtual convention venue where the participating attendee client can search the functional descriptive material and experience a virtual navigational experience based on the convention operational control parameter rules, pre-set by the meeting planner clients and exhibitor clients. The claims are directed to association meeting planners and tradeshow organizers (i.e., the end-users) building online tradeshows interactively by themselves. The claimed invention solves many fundamental problems and introduces functions missing in early website work and patents, and is a significant contribution to the state of the art.

For the foregoing reasons, none of independent claims 1, 39 and 40, as amended, are anticipated by or rendered obvious over the prior art of record, whether used alone or in combination. In particular, the Salesky patent nor any of the prior art of record teach or suggest the method and system for conducting a convention, as specifically set forth in these claims. There is no hint or suggestion in any of the references cited by the Examiner to combine these references in a manner that would render the invention, as claimed, obvious. Reconsideration of the rejection of independent claims 1, 39 and 40 is respectfully requested.

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116

Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2100

Application No. 09/869,513

Paper Dated: November 29, 2005

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 1762-010921

Claims 2-38 depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to independent claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 1. Further, claims 41 and 42 depend directly from independent claim 40 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 40. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-38, 41 and 42 is respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that claims 1-42 are patentable over the cited prior art and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By 

Nathan J. Prepelka
Registration No. 43,016
Attorney for Applicant
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818
Telephone: (412) 471-8815
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com